## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

PHARMASTEM THERAPEUTICS, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

V.

VIACELL, INC., a Delaware corporation, OBSTETRICAL AND GYNECOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES, P.A., FEMPARTNERS, INC., a Delaware corporation and CARITAS ST. ELIZABETH'S MEDICAL CENTER OF BOSTON, INC., a Massachusetts Nonprofit Corporation,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 04-CV-11673 RWZ

## **EXHIBIT 3**

TO

DECLARATION OF ATTORNEY EDWARD W. LITTLE, JR.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

PHARMASTEM THERAPEUTICS, INC.,

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff

v.

VIACELL, INC., et al.,

Defendants

: NO. 02-148 (GMS)

Wilmington, Delaware Friday, August 6, 2004 11:35 o'clock, a.m. \*\*\*Telephone conference

BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, U.S.D.C.J.

APPEARANCES:

POTTER, ANDERSON & CORROON BY: PHILIP A. ROVNER, ESQ.

-and-

PERKINS COIE, LLP
BY: PAUL J. ANDRE, ESQ. and
LISA KOBIALKA, ESQ.
(Menlo Park, California)

Counsel for Plaintiff

Valerie J. Gunning Official Court Reporter

Page 3 of 17 Multi-Page™ APPEARANCES (Continued): 1 morning. 2 RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER BY: JEFFREY L. MOYER, ESQ. 2 MR. KIRK: And Bill Abrams from Pillsbury 3 Winthrop, also for CBR. GOODWIN PROCTER, LLP Am I missing any on the defense side? JOHN C. ENGLANDER, ESQ., JAMES McGARRY, ESQ. and ELAINE BLAZE, ESQ. MR. McGARRY: Jim McGarry and Elaine Blaze from (Boston, Massachussetts) 6 Goodwin Procter. Counsel for ViaCell, Inc. 7 THE COURT: Good morning, all. 8 Morris, James, Hitchens & Williams, Llp For the plaintiff. BY: RICHARD K. KIRK, ESQ. 9 10 MR. ROVNER: Good morning, your Honor. This is -and-Phil Rovner from Potter Anderson on behalf of PharmaStern, and PILLSBURY WINTHRIP, LLP BY: WILLIAM F. ABRAMS, ESQ with me on the line is Paul Andre and Lisa Kobialka from 12 11 (San Diego, California) 12 13 Perkins Coie. Counsel for CBR Systems, Inc., 13 THE COURT: Good morning. 14 f/k/a Cord Blood Registry, Inc. 15 14 MR. ANDRE: Good morning, your Honor. DILWORTH PAXSON, LLP 16 15 THE COURT: All right. Well, thanks for getting JAMES F. RODGERS, ESQ. (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) 17 16 together on such short notice. Counsel for Corcell, Inc., Cryo-Cell and 18 17 As we all know, the defendants have collectively BirthGells 19 moved the Court for an expedited briefing schedule and 18 hearing wherein they seek to obtain an order finding the 20 19 21 plaintiff in contempt of the Court's July 2 order. 20 22 21 Who's going to address this for the defendants? 23 22 MR. ENGLANDER: I am, your Honor. John 23 Englander. 25 24 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Englander? 25 MR. ENGLANDER: Do you want me to just go? Page 3 Page 5 1 THE COURT: Let's go. 2 PROCEEDINGS MR. ENGLANDER: Okay. Your Honor, briefly, we 3 should start with the July 2nd order that we believe was (REPORTER'S NOTE: The following telephone violated. conference was held in chambers, beginning at 11:35 a.m.) The context of that order was a letter sent out 6 on June 1st or thereabouts by PharmaStem, disseminated to 7 THE COURT: Good morning. 25,000 obstetricians. MR. KIRK: Good morning, your Honor. 8 That letter contained many false statements. THE COURT: Counsel, is that you, Mr. Kirk? Do I Among them, one that we highlighted was an actual statement recognize your voice? that the Court had ruled with respect to obstetrician MR. KIRK: It is, your Honor. 11 liability. THE COURT: Do you want to start with 12 The letter had an immediate and substantial introductions? 13 impact on the industry. Essentially, turmoil. We had MR. KIRK: I will be happy to start with obstetricians refusing to collect. We had people who were 14 introductions from the defense side, your Honor. being -- who were giving birth and then found that they were 15 THE COURT: All right. 16 not going to get collected. MR KIRK: This is Dick Kirk from Morris James 17 And in our view, your Honor, was that this was for defendant CBR. PharmaStem's effort to essentially pressure the defendant 18 With me on the line I think in Delaware is through the obstetricians, because the obstetricians would 19 Jeff Moyer from Richards Layton, for ViaCell. Also on then refuse to do business with us, to take a license, and 20 the line are John Englander from Goodwin Procter for

21

22

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Cryo-Cell.

ViaCell, Jim Rodgers from Dilworth Paxson for CorCell and

MR. ABRAMS: I am. I'm on the line. Good

Is Bill Abrams on the phone yet?

The Court entered an order finding that the June 1 letter was false. That order set out particularly 23 limitations on contributory infringement that had been omitted from statements in the letter. And it concluded with

preempt the post-trial process that we're in.

Page 4

Page 6 1 an order that there would be no more false or misleading statements to obstetricians.

PharmaStem sought to vacate that order and also specifically address parts of that order in its motion and the Court did not vacate the order.

3

21

23

10

17

What we're seeking, your Honor, is really to avoid having PharmaStem distribute yet another misleading letter to the obstetricians. Essentially, to preserve the status quo while your Honor is considering the post-trial motions from trial.

And that's our principal concern. At this point, 11 the letter that, the August 2nd letter that's the subject of this motion has been posted on PharmaStem's website. We do not know if they have also made a mailing like they did last time, why they're distributing it to virtually all the obstetricians in the country. 16

17 We believe that the August 2nd letter is misleading. I will start by saying that it is not as directly false as the June 1 letter was. But we believe the paragraph that we've highlighted is intended to and does say 20 to obstetricians something that is very misleading, which is that they can be liable simply for the collection of 22 umbilical cord blood.

24 And the paragraph that we've highlighted in the August 2nd letter is in many ways very, very

similar to language that we also highlighted in the June 1 2 letter.

The letter essentially says, the paragraph that we've highlighted essentially says that if you're an obstetrician, you need a license to quote collect cord blood 6 or collect -- for the collection of umbilical cord blood, and 7 then couples that with a statement above it to the effect 8 that if you don't have such a license, you will be sued or you are subject to being sued.

Your Honor, we submit that those statements are misleading, and they are misleading in ways that were directly anticipated by the Court's July 2nd order 13 in the sense that, now, the prior briefing indicated that obstetricians cannot be liable under these method claims for contributory infringement simply for collection. At least they need to sell or offer to sell, at the very least.

18 And also that they, the obstetricians, 19 it's -- the Court's order says that they can't be liable if 20 all they're doing is selling a service. None of those 21 limitations are suggested in here, indicated in here, 22 reflected in here, in this August 2nd letter. Its intent and 23 purpose is, once again, to put the obstetricians in fear that simply collecting is sufficient, and in light of the briefing and the Court's order, we believe that that is misleading and 1 a violation of the Court's order.

Essentially, your Honor, the point comes down to this, which is PharmaStem is misusing its patents by claiming

Page 8

Page 9

threats that's not there and that the Court's orders at trial indicated is not there, in order to exert improper leverage

on the defendants.

And what we're seeking is an order preventing those, the dissemination of that kind of false statement. 9

THE COURT: Okay. Who's going to respond for PharmaStem? 10

11

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, this is Paul Andre.

12 THE COURT: Okay,

13 MR. ANDRE: I will respond.

I'm a little confused because Mr. Englander just 14 ended with saying that it's a false statement, but earlier he 15 said it's not a false statement. 16

17 So let me just address --

THE COURT: Well, I think he perhaps misspoke. 18 19 He did start out by indicating that he didn't believe that

the 8/2 statements of which he complains are as false as

those in the June 1 letter, but did go on to argue

essentially that they are misleading. 22

23 MR. ANDRE: Let me give you a little bit of 24 background --

THE COURT: Okay. Page 7

> MR. ANDRE: - relating to the new laws, your Honor.

There are several patents that issued during the pendency of the cases in front of this Court. Some of them

issued very late in the case and we did not add them into our

litigation against ViaCell and the other defendants at that time because of the late nature of when they issued.

8 We have initiated several lawsuits around the country, suing obstetricians against these two new patents

that were never before the Court here in Delaware. 10 11

In those complaints, we have alleged that obstetricians either, they infringe, inducing infringement or 12 contributory infringement one or more of these patents. 13

We have sued numerous obstetricians on this. We 14 believe it's something that a legal, viable theory and we intend on pursuing these litigations. There's nothing

misleading about the statement where it says, quite frankly, 17

that we have initiated lawsuits against obstetricians with

these patents and that our license agreement provide license

to obstetricians that license with cord blood banks. That's 21 all true.

It's not - Mr. Englander said we did not put 22 23 forward the elements of contributory infringement. We're not certain we're going after contributory infringement or the obstetricians, to be quite frank.

I don't want to give up our legal theory, but we do have issues of inducement to infringe as well.

So it is something that --

3

14

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

5

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Andre: Do you believe that it's possible that in light of the June 1 mailing taken together, the August 2 posting -- by the way,

was this a mailing as well as a posting on the website?

8 MR. ANDRE: I believe it was, your Honor, yes. THE COURT: Okay. Was the 8/2 mailing to the same physicians who received the 6/1 mailing, that is the 10 11 category of physicians known as obstetricians?

12 MR. ANDRE: I believe that it was, your Honor. I 13 don't know. We were obviously not involved in this. The mailing service does this type of work for companies.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Would you concede the 16 possibility, if not the likelihood, that the combination of the two mailings, if not one and/or the other alone, standing alone, might have a chilling effect on the practice insofar as it involves the collection of cord blood by these physicians?

MR. ANDRE: I would think not because we have 15 other companies that are licensing and that we have -- that have made inroads throughout the nation and can facilitate the collection of cord blood.

THE COURT: so you think they would merely turn

Page 11

to those other companies? 2

MR. ANDRE: Absolutely. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry I interrupted.

MR. ANDRE: That's quite all right.

And I guess what would be important is to take a step back. What really prompted the June 1st mailing, which was sent out by Mr. Didier, and we will concede that there are perhaps a single word or two that could have been clearer, but, you know, he gave his understanding as a 11 layperson, not as a lawyer, obviously.

But what had happened, after we had obtained this jury verdict, the defendants in this case have been telling all (inaudible), we've got numerous, I mean dozens and dozens reports of this that the Court would not sustain this jury verdict and that there was no need to worry.

So we actually wanted to put people on notice, obstetricians and others, that these patents are -- have not been overturned and that we intend to enforce them.

THE COURT: So you're saying, your mailing, your June 1 mailing, at least, was a reaction to a campaign by -well, you did not use that word, I'm using it, but at least statements by the defendants that the Court would not sustain the verdict?

MR ANDRE: That's correct. And so the June 1st

1 mailing went out.

I don't know if you notice in the letter we sent to the Court-yesterday, if you look at the amazing increase

in revenues and business that has resulted, it is pretty

astounding when you see the companies have increased their

growth rate of 83 percent in light of CBR, they have the finding of willful infringement against them.

So they have been very aggressive in continuing their marketing activities, telling all obstetricians and anyone else who would listen, even pressuring our eventual 11 licensees not to take a license.

12 We have now licensed the entire industry but with 13 the exception of these defendants that we've sued in this new realm of lawsuits.

And the June 1st letter went out. Where it said 15 the Court ruled, it should have been the jury found that 16 infringement occurs. That's a layperson's misunderstanding 18 more than anything else.

19 This new press release that was released on the 2nd is nothing -- is not unsimilar to any other press release we've put out. We had a, since the trial last November,

22 October, November, we had another lawsuit in the Northern 23 District of California where we named five cord blood banks

24 releasing exactly a press release that's almost identical to

25 what's in here. Those five cord blood banks have taken

Page 13

Page 12

I licenses. We've dismissed that case. We're going through 2 another round.

This is almost identical to what has been put 3 4 forward previously. The only difference in this particular case, we are suing obstetricians.

And it's something that they find problematic is 7 a quote from Mr. Didier saying that we prefer not to sue obstetricians. That's not something we would prefer. We prefer not to do that, but we have to protect our 10 intellectual property.

11 And then informing them there are licenses, they are spelled out in the contracts, that if the obstetricians have a license, pass through license to any other 14 obstetrician who uses a cord blood bank.

15 So it it does not have a chilling effect 16 whatsoever. If you look at their growth rates, it's just the 17 opposite.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Englander?

19 MR. ROVNER: Your Honor, this is Phil Rovner. 20

Before Mr. Englander speaks, can I just address one of the procedural issues that occurred during the defendants' first motion practice on this issue 22 23 on June 30?

24 THE COURT: I'm not interested in talking about 25 procedure, Mr. Rovner, dating back to the -- does it have

Document 31-4 Multi-Page Case 1:04-cv-11673-RWZ Filed 11/22/2004 Page 6 of 17

Page 14

1 relevance to the substance -- substantive issues we're 2 talking about right now?

3 MR. ROVNER: Mr. Englander mentioned that we had 4 moved to vacate the order and that your Honor didn't grant it. That motion, as far as we understand it, is still pending.

THE COURT: That motion will remain pending, Mr. Rovner, until I address it. You're right. That's correct. But what does that add to the discussion of the substance is my query to you.

11

12

MR. ROVNER: Well, it --THE COURT: I mean, you're right, it corrects Mr. 13 Englander's statements. You're right about that. That 14 motion is still before the Court.

MR. ROVNER: Okay. Well, I just wanted that to 15 be clear because they moved for a TRO as well as a preliminary injunction, and the TRO was granted by your Honor as well as the preliminary injunction, but prior to the time that we had an opportunity to respond. And that is now fully 20 briefed.

21 THE COURT: I'm aware of these things, Mr. 22 Rovner.

23 MR. ROVNER: Okay.

24 THE COURT: Again, is there a reason that you felt it necessary to bring that to my attention right this

moment?

1

2 MR. ROVNER: I just wanted the record to reflect what the procedural --

THE COURT: Mr. Englander, would you please reply to Mr. Andre's substantive comments?

MR. ENGLANDER: I will, your Honor.

I think what I said was that these statement in the August 2 letter are not as directly false. They are, we believe, misleading on their own.

I think as well the Court's comment that in 10 combination with the prior letter, there is real misleading 12 effect here is right.

13 You know, there was a prior letter to these 14 25,000 people and now we hear those same people are getting 15 this additional letter that's simply going to compound what 16 they've already heard, which, you know, to the effect that 17 the Court has ruled with respect to obstetrician liability 18 and without any reference to the limitations on obstetrician 19 liability.

20 Now, Mr. Andre says that there hasn't been any 21 chilling effect from those letters. Your Honor, I think the record was replete in our last filing as to the effect of the letters and it was immediate and it was very significant. 23

24 The Court Order of July 2nd allowed us with respect to those people who contacted us to blunt the effect

Page 16 1 of that letter. But we don't know how many thousands of

2 obstetricians are worried, are concerned. We know there were many who immediately responded, including major practices who

started refusing to collect.

This letter is going to compound that. That's why we're here, your Honor, because there's a very

significant concern on the part of all defendants, based on

the track record that this letter, which we now learned has been sent out, is going to cause significant, immediate

irreparable harm, both to us and to people whose collections 11 are at issue.

12 Mr. Andre suggests that all that's going to 13 happen is these people will go to the other licensees. I don't know where that comes from. There's certainly no evidence that that is happening in major part. 15 16

My understanding is the four defendants before the Court still represent roughly 80 percent of 17 the market here. So I don't think that it's, you know, 18 glibly saying, which, of course, is their intent, that 19 these people will just go to the competition. That 20 wasn't what happened last time and there's no evidence 22 that that is going to happen.

23 Mr. Andre commented that the patent that the obstetricians have been sued on is not the same as the '553. 24

Your Honor, the '427 patent, which we attached,

Page 15

1 has essentially the same claims as the '553. And in fact,

there was litigation over this patent before you in advance 3 of trial because they wanted to talk about it as evidence.

4 And during that litigation, Mr. Andre represented to the

Court that the '427 claims were essentially the same as the

'553 claims and handed up a chart to that effect. I believe

it's in the transcript.

The last thing I want to talk about, Mr. Andre indicated that the June 1 letter was a response to the defendants telling people that the Court would not sustain 11 the verdict.

12

Again, there's no evidence in the record, and they filed a very lengthy response back in July about this, 13 no evidence that that is why they sent their letter, that the 15 defendants were saying that. And I can say on behalf of

16 ViaCell, ViaCell has filed an S1 in the meantime and I

17 believe the S1 is pretty accurate in saying what the risks 18 are with respect to the jury verdict and what may come of

19 that jury verdict.

20 So this may have happened, but certainly this 21 is the first time that this excuse has been offered by the plaintiff for the nature of the correspondence that they've directed at the obstetricians. 23

24 THE COURT: Mr. Andre? 25

MR. ANDRE: Yes. I guess what Mr. Englander and

Page 18

1 the defendants are complaining about is that the -- this 2 press release, the August 2nd press release has a potential

Case 1:04-cv-11673-RWZ

3 of giving obstetricians the notification that they may be

4 held liable for collecting cord blood banks from unlicensed

5 cord blood - collecting cord blood for unlicensed cord blood banks.

7 And that is exactly true. We are suing obstetricians for doing exactly that. There is a potential of liability. That's not misleading; that is an absolute 10 truth.

11 We are going to continue to find obstetricians who collect for unlicensed cord blood banks and sue them. And we have not only a right, we have an obligation to put people on notice of these patents, because if you don't give them proper notice and the idea there might be potential liability, you cannot expect them to stop their behavior. And that's an obligation of a patentee.

16

17

21

1

11

15

16

22

23

24

18 Now, Mr. Englander said the Court has not ruled 19 regarding obstetrician liability. That's correct. We did not bring that forward in the Court in Delaware. We will be 20 bringing that forward in the five courts in which we filed 22 these lawsuits. It is a very real possibility, and from our point of view, a very real probability that obstetricians will be held liable for patent infringement, asserting one of the theories of patent infringement that I talked about

earlier.

2 With respect to the '427 patent that Mr. Englander mentioned, I did bring it to the Court's attention,

brought one single claim to the Court's attention. 5

There are numerous claims in this patent and claims that are -- that were not before the Court in Delaware, claims we intend on pursuing in the new cases, and that are substantially different than the cases that have

been tried already, and would need further claim construction 10 to boot.

So the fact that there is a single similar claim 12 that led to this patent having a terminal disclaimer to the '553 to avoid any type of double-patenting issues is irrelevant to the fact that we have a new lawsuit with new defendants and new claims that we will be pursuing.

So to say that this press release that went out 17 on August 2nd is misleading is incorrect. It's not 18 misleading. It's telling the absolute truth. It is conveying a message, obstetricians can be sued for patent infringement, and they have been, and they will continue being sued for patent infringement if we find out about them infringing our patent,

THE COURT: Mr. --

MR. ANDRE: I don't know how else to notify obstetricians about these patents pursuant to our duty as 1 patentee and I don't know how, you know, how we can make this

press release, you know, informing the public about these new

lawsuits any more benign.

There's nothing in the statement even that Mr.

5 Englander read, the paragraph they highlighted. I don't know if it's in front of the Court?

7 THE COURT: Yes, it is.

8 MR. ANDRE: I don't know how that can be made any

9 more benign or any more correct than it is.

THE COURT: Mr. Englander, you do, at Page 7 of 10 your memorandum, point out that you, the defendants 11

collectively, do not complain about the announcement of these

lawsuits. And Mr. Andre points out in his recent remarks 13

that they are, in point of fact, they have initiated lawsuits 14

15 against obstetricians on a theory.

I'm not sure what the theory is. I'm not sure 16 that I need to know at this point. But that is merely a 17

statement of fact, and you don't complain about the fact of

the announcement of the lawsuits. Why, then, do you complain of obstetricians, suits against obstetricians and others?

21 What is it that you complain -- go ahead.

22 MR. ENGLANDER: Your Honor, I think that the

23 reason that we are not complaining here about the

announcement of the lawsuits is because our understanding of

the law is that they can announce the existence of a lawsuit

Page 19 1 provided they do so in good faith.

> But, your Honor, what we're trying to focus on is a paragraph below the two paragraphs that talk about the lawsuit.

5 THE COURT: I understand that. The language that's in quotes. While we would prefer not to sue.

MR. ENGLANDER: And I think, if I could, because 8 I think that, you know, we don't think they can assert a

lawsuit against an obstetrician in good faith, your Honor, especially based on what has gone on in your courtroom and

rulings that you made with respect to jury instructions. But

12 Mr. Andre says differently and we understand that that is not 13 what the Court wants to rule on.

14 THE COURT: Right. And that issue has not been 15 teed up for me.

16 MR. ENGLANDER: Right. And what we're focusing 17 on is really what I perceive, I think, as thumbing their nose at the Court Order in this sense: The one thing that we made clear in our documents previously was that their letter of 19 June 1 suggests that obstetricians can be liable simply for 20 collecting cord blood and that that is inaccurate. 21

THE COURT: And that's one of the reasons that 22 23 caused me to sign and issue the order.

24 MR. ENGLANDER: And they are saying the same thing in that paragraph. They're saying it very craftily,

1 but they are saying the same thing because they talk about 2 getting a license for the collection of umbilical cord blood 3 and they do it without reference to the limitations which

your Honor is well aware of and which are in that Order and 5 which they are well aware of.

And Mr. Andre says I don't know how I could have done this any more benignly. Well, how about telling the

truth? How about being accurate? How about reflecting to 9 the world that there is at least a disagreement as to whether

10 obstetricians can be liable for the collection of umbilical

11 cord blood? That there are limitations on contributory 12 infringement?

13

There's no doubt that there is no direct liability for patent infringement under the '427 or the '553. Obstetricians simply do not perform all the steps of

any of those, and I don't think Mr. Andre is suggesting 17 that. 18

So there are only two other theories on which they could be liable: Contributory infringement 19 and now Mr. Andre is suggesting inducing infringement

for the first time, your Honor. We heard it today for the 21 first time. 22 23

As to contributory infringement, we've been over and over this. Your Honor has been over it and your Honor has indicated what your views on it. And for them to leave

1 that out, especially in light of the order, we think is misleading. We think it's in contempt. 3

The suggestion that they get around it because some obstetrician somewhere might have been involved in inducing infringement I think is a very weak argument, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ENGLANDER: If they wanted to make this accurate, they could have. But they didn't, because what they want to do is leave the obstetricians, the general 25,000 obstetricians not familiar with the litigation before

your court in fear that they will be liable simply for collecting cord blood. 13

14 THE COURT: Mr. Andre?

15 MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, once again, Mr.

Englander -- I don't see where he's pointing to in the press 16 release because I mean that is the issue here. 17 18

THE COURT: Well, look at - I think if you --

19 MR. ENGLANDER: It's the last sentence of the third paragraph coupled with the reference in the first 20 phrase to the fact that we would prefer not to sue.

22 MR. ANDRE: Yes. PharmaStem's license agreements 23 provide a license to obstetricians and health care providers 24 for the collection of umbilical cord blood provided they work with licensed banks. That's a true statement.

MR. ENGLANDER: I actually think it's probably

inaccurate, the license for the collection of umbilical cord blood.

Page 24

Page 25

Getting past that, standing alone, even if it's 4 accurate, our view is together, in a crafty paragraph, what

you are saying is you need a license to collect umbilical

cord blood. If you don't, you will be sued.

MR. ANDRE: We are suing obstetricians, that is correct. And our theory with two new patents that are not before the Delaware Court, but these two patents are theories

of infringement that have been alleged in the complaint are 11 direct inducement and/or contributory. 12

13 We believe that, at the very least, we have very strong evidence of inducement to infringe. 14

Now, in a press release, I don't think we have 15 put forward all of our legal theories. 16

17 In your Honor's July 2nd order, the order is very clear. It says you shall not make false or misleading 18 statements to obstetricians.

20 THE COURT: That's true.

21 MR. ANDRE: And we have not made false or 22 misleading statements.

23 The order states that the missing elements for contributory infringement are that you must list three elements in that order, required for contributory

Page 23

infringement.

Well, at this point, we're not certain we're

going to be alleging contributory infringement against these obstetricians. We have alleged the various acts of

infringement and we believe we have good cases of inducement to infringe. 6

THE COURT: Mr. Andre, let me interrupt for a 7 second. I will let you go again. 8

9 MR. ANDRE: Sure.

10 THE COURT: But I am troubled by the context, and as they say, the totality of the circumstances. And what

I mean by that is I think I've alluded to it earlier: The

June 1 letter and this release and the particular statement 14

or paragraphs that we're talking about right now.

I think that you are correct: That it is my view 15 at this stage of this discussion that PharmaStem is probably 17 not in contempt of the Court's July 2 order. You point out that the order was directed or directed PharmaStem -- it was directed to letters to obstetricians, number one.

20 This August 2 press release is not directed in the same fashion. It's at least for that reason, and perhaps others, that it would be, I think, prudent for the Court to consider this as a motion to amend the July 2 order rather 24 than to find PharmaStem in contempt of that order.

Having said that, regardless of how the motion is

Multi-Page™

3

1 styled, I still have the concern, Mr. Andre, that when read

2 by the same group of physicians, you know, the same

3 practitioners that you mailed to back in June when the 8/2

4 release is read, when it comes in the mail or they visit the

website, that it's going to have a similarly chilling effect,

which I felt under the circumstances, for the reasons

articulated in the order, was inappropriate. 8

10

11

23

12

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think you are probably right: That the statement that we're talking about in the 8/2 release doesn't offend or does not mislead or isn't false to the same degree that the June 1 statement did.

12 But I think that Mr. Englander is correct in 13 that, without setting forth necessarily or revealing your theory of the case or the cases against whomever you elect to 14 bring them, that as you put it, a more benign or a perhaps 15 more accurate statement could have been made and perhaps can 16 be made that would not have as a chilling effect. It's going 17 to have a chilling effect. I've got to believe particularly large groups are going to be running to their lawyers to try to figure out whether they can collect, safely collect cord 20 blood. And that remains an issue extant that has been, as you all know, joined before this Court and is being considered presently.

24 I understand the need for the marketplace to 25 continue. Things do not necessarily come to a grinding halt

when you walk into a courtroom, but you are in litigation,

all the parties on this line, and, unfortunately, perhaps, or

3 maybe fortunately, that is a deliberate process. Maybe

altogether too deliberate for all concerned here. But it is what it is, and it's going to take the time it takes.

My feeling is that parties on both sides should do what they can to move cautiously forward in your efforts to market your products and your services without involving the Court as, or attempting to utilize the win or the loss as an imprimatur, as a shield or a sword, in those efforts. I think it's a dangerous game you play, and you play it at your peril, both of you.

13 So I'm interested in knowing what, if anything, you can conceive among you that you can do about this release that will accommodate PharmaStem's right to announce, in good 15 16 faith, the existence of lawsuits and its intent to protect 17 its intellectual property rights while at the same time not interfering with this Court's process and interfering with 18 the ability of potential consumers out there, obstetricians and patients, to collect cord blood in an appropriate way.

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, this is Paul Andre once again.

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. ANDRE: I appreciate the Court's comments and we obviously, PharmaStem has a very large interest in the

1 continued collection of cord blood. That's how we derive our

revenues, licensing.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ANDRE: We have, as you can see on the press

5 release, 15 licensees, licensed the entire industry with the exception of the defendants. We want them to collect as much

as possible. We want them to be very successful.

8 The defendants are saying it has a chilling effect on their business by us suing them and suing

obstetricians who we believe work with them. 10

11 If it has a chilling effect on them, that is not necessarily relevant one way or the other, because the 12

industry is being serviced by these 15 defendants. 13

14 We want the -- our licensees to be protected. In 15 fact, we have obligations to our licensees.

These people are paying a royalty to us to use 16 the technology in the patent whereas other companies who are 17

not paying such a royalty are continuing and they're

competitors. They're at a competitive disadvantage because 20 of that.

21 So whereas -- you know, our goal is not to 22 interfere with this Court's process. That's the reason the

patents that are in this press release, that are in this

24 lawsuit, are not the patents that are in front of the Court.

25 This lawsuit is very distinguishable from the Court. There

1 will be new legal theories, we are doing what we can to protect our intellectual property and to protect our

licensees.

We also, regretfully, are suing obstetricians.

This is not something we want to do. We would rather not do this. But, nonetheless, we have to protect our intellectual

property and we will continue doing so.

If it has a chill effect on the unlicensed cord bloods business, then that's an unfortunate consequence of the unlicensed cord blood banks refusing to take a

11 license.

12 THE COURT: What about the obstetricians and 13 patients who want to have -- who cannot have their cord blood collect as a result of, or may elect not to as a result of

15 reading this release?

16 MR. ANDRE: I think there are, like I said, there are numerous opportunities. And that was the purpose of this

18 release and defending the - the letter actually informs

obstetricians that they don't need to worry. They won't be

sued if they use these 15 companies. And they find that

offensive, and that is -- it's something that we are trying 21

to keep the obstetricians, let them know, keep collecting, this is a good thing. 23

24

25

MR. ENGLANDER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. ENGLANDER: - I heard what you said and I 2 think, to some extent, you were suggesting could the parties get together and agree on something.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ENGLANDER: And I have some ideas on that and 6 I would be happy to try, but my sense is perhaps that there's no receptivity on the other side. And if this letter has already gone out, I'm not sure what can be done. 9

THE COURT: Well, the letter is gone and --

10 MR. ENGLANDER: And directly to 25,000 obstetricians, apparently. 11

12 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ENGLANDER: And we know what's going to 13 happen next. Our phones are going to start ringing. 14

15 And I mean we can certainly think about what we think would bring this back to neutral, if you will, because 16

I understand that to be what the Court is saying. 17 18

THE COURT: Yes. That's what I am saying.

19 MR. ENGLANDER: Move forward --20

THE COURT: That's where it needs to be. It needs to be a neutral and the parties need to recognize that 21 22 you are in a litigation process that you need to have

23 patience with. 24

I understand, Mr. Andre, that, you know, the business your client is in, but this is the American justice 25

Page 32 I like I said, was attempted to be -- not have the chill effect

on the obstetrician community or the people who would want to

have this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

THE COURT: Well, if both views are considered, 4 albeit perhaps not accepted, considered for purposes, at

least, of a limited period of time while the Court resolves

at least in Delaware the issues before it, it may be that -there are a lot of smart people on this phone call that you

can come up with with some language that would at least

provide a temporary solution, if not a permanent one. 10

11 I'm not saying that one or the other of you would have to, collective defendants on the one hand and PharmaStem on the other, would have to necessarily accept the theory that might underlie the particular language that you are able 14 15 to agree upon.

But I hope that the Court's concerns are going to 16 17

be taken seriously. And if you are willing to talk -MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, we're always willing. If 18 Mr. Englander or any of the other defendants' counsel would 19

prefer to, like to give us language, we would definitely consider it, and obviously if it was language we found

acceptable, we'd post it on the website and put it in a press

release. We have no problem with that. 23

MR. ENGLANDER: But not send it out to the 25,000 24 25 people?

Page 31

system, and this is the way it works. And I do, quite

frankly, believe that things like this, and I mean by that

3 the 8/2 release, tend to interfere with the deliberative

processes. At least I have that feeling about my deliberate process insofar as the case before me is concerned.

And I am not as much concerned as you seem to be 6 focusing on the profits of the defendants. I am very much concerned about obstetricians and families being threatened

9 in a way that's going to cause them, perhaps improperly, that

10 has not been decided yet, to lose a once-in-a-lifetime 11

opportunity. That's the classic definition of irreparable 12 harm.

Go ahead.

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

MR. ANDRE: I agree, your Honor. It's something that we do not want to have that chill effect. We want to let obstetricians know and families, whoever reads this, that there are viable alternatives, and that they have a license.

17 18 THE COURT: Well, is there any -- does PharmaStem, Mr. Andre, believe that it would be possible to 19 amend this language in a way that would satisfy the needs and concerns of all of the entities at the table, or is that just

something that you don't think is worth discussing? MR. ANDRE: Well, we're always open, your Honor, of course, to any kind of discussion. I don't know what -- I would have a hard time because this is a press release that,

1 MR. ANDRE: Pardon me?

> 2 MR. ENGLANDER: But not send out another mailing?

4 MR. ANDRE: Well, if there's a possibility --MR. ENGLANDER: That -- that may be acceptable,

6 Paul.

14

23

24

7 MR. ANDRE: We're very agreeable.

We have to let the obstetricians know that we're not going to sue them if they use one of these 15 licensed banks. If they are using a bank that's not licensed, whether

11 it be the defendants' --

THE COURT: Let's do this, Mr. Andre. Let's do 12 this. Let give counsel an opportunity to talk. 13

MR. ANDRE: Okay.

15 THE COURT: Okay? The Court will hold this 16

matter under advisement. The problem -- the reason, one of the reasons I wanted to get on the phone with you so quickly 17

without, with apologies to PharmaStem, giving you the 18

opportunity for a written response, is that I'm about to 19

leave. Today is my last day in the office for the next 20

couple of weeks. And, believe me, I won't be addressing 21

22 PharmaStem and ViaCell.

MR. ANDRE: Let's hope not.

Your Honor, I assume I can talk to Mr. Englander, 25 Mr. Abrams and Mr. Rodgers and any other counsel that we need

Page 33

```
Page 34
     I to talk to.
     2
              THE COURT: Sure.
              MR. ANDRE: Can we assume for the purposes of
    4 this discussion that the opposition briefing to this motion
      is stayed --
              THE COURT: Yes.
              MR. ANDRE: - until we get back with your
    8
      Honor?
   9
             THE COURT: Yes. If you want to try to get back
      on the phone with me today, we might be able to do that. I
      don't know what your schedules are like and how much time
  12 counsel are going to be able to devote to this issue. But
     this would be the last opportunity you're going to have to
     talk with me about it for the next couple of weeks.
 15
            MR. ENGLANDER: Well, we'll certainly try to do
     that, your Honor.
 17
            THE COURT: Okay.
 18
            MR. ENGLANDER: Because I guess my suspicion is
    that we will have difficulty coming to agreement and we may
    wind up having to ask the Court to do something in the way of
20
    an order instead. And I know that's not the Court's desire
21
    and we're going to do our best to have that not happen.
22
23
           MR ENGLANDER: Well, it is not the Court's best
    wish. And, again, I want to remind you, Mr. Englander, that
25
   I am not inclined to a finding of contempt under the
                                                         Page 35
   circumstances. I may be inclined to a different type of
   order or request.
3
          MR. ENGLANDER: Understood, your Honor.
4
         THE COURT: All right, then, counsel. If you are
  able to reach an accord or not, you probably, either way,
  should get in touch with Ms. Tyre-Daley and let us know
  whether you can and want to get back on the phone today.
  Otherwise, we will be looking at this at some date in the
  near term.
         MR. ENGLANDER: Thank you, your Honor.
         THE COURT: And, Mr. Rovner, the motion to
 dissolve will continue to be held in its present status of
 abeyance. Okay?
        MR. ROVNER: Thank you, your Honor.
        THE COURT: All right. Take care, counsel.
        (Counsel respond "Thank you, your Honor.")
       (Telephone conference concluded at 12:20 p.m.)
```

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

· <u>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </u>		• •	11673-R	RWZ	Docu	ument	31-4 Mul	File ti-Pagc	<b>d</b> ₄11	/22/2	004	Pag	e 12 of 17	0~	
19:2	1 16:25	17:5	add [2]		14:9	An	dre's [1]	15:		29:10	29:13	3	26:20	27:20	conto
'553 <sub>[5]</sub>	22:14			onal [1]		ann	ounce			blood		- 29:9		27:20	28:
17:6	19:13	22:15	addres	8 <b>8 [5]</b> 8:17	4:21	27:					ը <u>լ</u> յ 15:25	5	collecte	d [1]	5:16
-and [3]	1:18	2:3	14:8	0:17	13:21	20:	ouncen 12 20:		, <sub>4</sub>		19:10	)	collectin		7:24
2:10			addres	sing [1]	33:21			i [1] 7:12	, (	Bosto		2:6	23-13	18:5	21:2
02-148		1:8	advano		17:2	apo	logies	ıj 33:1		briefe	d [1]	14:2	Collectic	29:22 <b>)Ti</b> fial	6:22
1 [10] 7:1	5:23 8:21	6:19 10:5	advise			APF	EARA	NCES		briefin 7:13	ng [4] 7:24	4:18 34:4	7:6	7:15	10:1
11:21	17:9	21:20	again [17:12	7; 7:23 23:15	14:24	1:16				briefly		5:2	10.24	22:2 24:2	22:10 28:1
25:13 11 [2]	26:11		27:22	34:24	25:8		eciate	[1] 27:2 [1] 27:2	4 1	bring (	5] 14:25	18:2			
1 -	1:11 35:17	3:5	against		9:6		Oprian C[1] 8:21		1	19:3	26:15		6   collectiv	elil	32:12
.1	10:21	28:5	9:9 20:15	9:18 20:20	12:7 21:9		ment [1			pringi		18:2	collectiv		4:17
28:13	29:20	33:9	25:3	26:14	21:9		ulated	-	- 1	orough ousine		19:4	20:12		
	5:6	11:7	aggress	ive [1]	12:8	asser		21:8		12:4	28:9	5:20 29:9	combinat	11011 [2	10:16
	12:15		agree [3]	30:3	31:14	asser	ting [1]	18:24		30:25	•		coming [1	1	34:19
	4:20 25:17	10:6 25:20	32:15	10	AA =		me [2]	33:24		[2]	2:5	3:2	comment		15:10
25:23			agree ab		33:7	34:3	ınding	[1] 12:5	10	Califor 2:12	nia [3] 12:23	1:21	comment	ed [1]	
	35:17		34:19	JHT [2]	9:19		hed (1)	16:25		z.12 ampai	-	11:21	comment		15:5
2004 [1] 25,000 [5	1:11		agreeme	ents [1]	23:22		ipted [1]		c	annot	[3]	7:14	27:24 communi	tar	20.0
15:14	ฤ 23:11	5:7 30:10	ahead [3]		11:3	attem	pting (	1] 27:9	۱.	18:16	29:13	-	companie		32:2 10:14
32:24			I -	31:13 1:7		attent	tion [3] 19:4	14:25		are [2] ase [6]		35:15	10:22 11	l:1	12:5
2nd[11] 5		6:12 7:12	albeit [1]		32:5	Augu		1:11	- 1 :	13:1	າລ 13:5	11:13 26:14	28:17 29 competitie	):20	16.00
7:22 1	2:20	15:24	alleged	3]	9:11	6:12	6:17	6:25	- 1	31:5			competiti	ле uı nπ [t]	28-10
		24:17		25:4		7:22 18:2	10:6 19:17	15:8 25:20		1 <b>ses</b> [5] 19:8	9:4 25:5	19:7 26:14	competito	TS [1]	28:19
1	3:23 :11	2.5	alleging allowed	=	25:3 15:24	avoid		6:7		itegory		10:11	complain	[4]	20:12
	:11	3:5	alluded [		15;24 25;12	19:13			Ca	iused [	ıj ·	21:23			20:21
1 - 7.7	O:10		almost [2		12:24	aware		14:21	CZ	utious	ly [1]	27:7	complaini 20:23	ng (2)	18:1
7[1] 20	0:10		13:3	-			22:5 1 round	11 8-24	C	BR [4] : :3	2:13 12:6	3:18	complains	[1] 8	8:20
		10:9	alone [3] 1 24:4	0:17	10:18	bank (	2] 13:14	33:10		rtain (2		9:24	complaint	(1) 2	24:11
1	6:9 ; 6:17	31:3	alternativ	ves [1]	31:17	banks	[9]	9:20	2	5:2		•	complaints		
I	2:6 .	1	altogethe	r[1]	27:4	12:23 18:6	12:25 18:12	18:4 23:25	ce	rtainly 7:20		16:14	compound 16:5	[2] 1	5:15
a.m [2] 1:	11 3	3:5	always [2] 32:18	3	1:23	29:10	33:10			amber	S [1]	34:15 3:5	concede [2]	1	0:15
abeyance		35:13	amazing [	11 1	2:3	based ( 21:10	2]	16:7	ch	art [i] 1	7:6		11:8		
ability[1] able[4] 32	2	:7:19	amend [2]		5:23	beginn	ing m	3:5	ch	ill <sub>[3]</sub> 2		31:15	conceive [1]		7:14 :11
34:12 35	::14 3 ::5	4:10	31:20		ı	behalf	[2] [2]	4:10		::1 illing <sub>[</sub> :	n-v	10.10	16:7 26:1		.11
above [1]	7.		American		0:25	17:15	-		13		=	10:18 26:5	concerned		6:2
Abrams [5]		:12	among [2] 27:14	5		behavi		18:16		:17 2		28:8	27:4 31:5 31:8	3	1:6
3:24 3:2 33:25	25 4:		Anderson	[2] ]		below ( benign		21:3 20:3		:11 cumsta	inces (	· 	concerns [2]	31	1:21
absolute [2]	] 18	8.0	4:10		- [	20:9	26:15	20:3	25	:11 20	6:6	ני 35:1	32:16		
19:18	_	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Andre [55] 4:11 4:1			benignl	y [1]	22:7	Cr	VIL [1]		1:4	concluded [35:17	2j 5::	25
Absolutely		1:2	8:11 8:1	13 8:	23	est [2]	34:22	34:23	cla 19:	im [3]	1	9:4	conference	3] 1:1	12
accept [1]		1	9:1 10 10:12 10:		):8   I	Bill [2]	3:24	4:2		iming [	9:11 11 - 8	:3	3:5 35:1 <sup>-7</sup>		-~
33:5	[4] 32		11:5 11:	:25 15	:2   t	oirth [1] BirthCe	5:15 Heres	2,10	clai	ms [8]		:15	confused [1]	8:1	
accepted [1]	32		16:12 16:	:23 17	:4	oit [1]		2:18	17:	1 17	':5 1	7:6	consequence		
accommod	ate [1]		17:8 17: 19:24 20:		13 E	Blaze [2]		2:6	19: 19:		r:o 1:	9:7	consider [2] 32:21	25:	:23
27:15 accord[1]	25	2	21:12 22:	6 22	:16	4:5				sic [1]	3	1:11	considered [	<b>3</b> 26:	23
accurate [5]	35: 17:		22:20 23: 23:22 24:			lood (27 6:23	7:5	2:14 7:6	clea	I[3] 14		1:19	32:4 32:5		
22:8 23:9		5 2	25:7 25:	9 26:	1   9		7:5 10:19	10:24	24:			- 1	considering	[1] 6:9	
26:16	_	1 2	27:21 27:2 28:4 29:3			12:23	12:25	13:14		rer [1] nt [1]			construction		
ACTION [1]		'   3	30:4 29;; 31:14 31:1				18:5 18:12			սե[լ] Շ[2] 1:1	30 o ₄.		consumers (1) contacted (1)	27:1 15:2	
acts [1] 25:4		9   3	2:18 33:1	l 33:	4 2	22:2	22:11	23:13	colle	7[2] 1:1 Ct[11]	9 4: 5:		contained [1]	5:8	
actual [1]	5:9		3:7 33:1 3:23 34:3					24:/	7:5	7:6	16	:4	contempt [5]		
(1)	J.7			, J4;	'   4	:U:ZI	27:20	28:1	18:1	2 24;		:20	23:2 25:17	25:2	
											<u> </u>				1

. '			04-cv-1167	73-RWZ	Docu	ment 31	4. F	iled.1	1/22/20	04 Pa	age 13	of 17		
•		34:25		23: 23:	14 23:18	difficu	Autti-Pa					conte	xt - ha	ppenin
•		context [2]		24:10 24:	20 25:7	Dilwor	nty [1]	34:19	8:14	9:22	13:18	felt [2]	14.25	26:6
		25:10	t t	25:10 25:2 27:9 27:2		3:22	LL1 [2]	2:15	13:20 15:6	14:3 17:25	13;4	figure	1	26:20
		continue [5] 19:20 26:25	10.11	27:9          27:2 28:24         28:2		direct [	21	22:13	19:3		18:18 20:10	filed [3]	17-11	17:16
•		35:12	29:7	29:25 30:4		24:12	<b>-</b> ];	24:13	20:22		21.16	18:21	•	1 \:10
		continued [2]	2.1	30:12 30:1	7 30:18	directe	d rsı	17:23	21:24	23:8	23:16	filing (1)		15:22
		28:1		30:20 31:1 2:6 33:1:	8 32:4	25:18		25:19	23:19 29:24	24:1	26:12 J	finding (	41	4:19
		continuing [2]		2:6 33:1: 3:15 34:2		25:20			30:10		ן כיטי	5:22	12:7	34:25
		28:18		4:9 34:17		directly 7:12	[4]	6:19	32:19	<b>.</b> .	2.2	FINGER	[1]	2:2
		contracts [1]	13-12 3	5:4 35:11			15:8	30:10		33:24	4:15	irst [5]		17:21
	. [	contributory	[12]  Co	ourt's [16]	4:20	disadva 28:19	ntage [1]			34:23 3				23:20
	· 1	3:24 7:15	9:13   7:	12 7:19	7:25	disagree	mantro			35:10	1	ïve [3] 1 18:21	2:23	12:25
	. 1	9:23 9:24 22:19 22:23	22:11 8: 24:12 19	1 8:4 9:3 19:4	15:10	22:9	ment[I]		England entered		1.1.			
	- 1	24:24 24:25		19:4 18 27:24	25:17 28:22	disclaim	ermi	9:12	entire [2]	-		ocus [1]2 Ocusing [		
	0	onveying [1]	19-19 32	:16 34:21	34:23	discussi	02711 3	1:22	28:5		2:12	31:7	2] 2	21:16
	- 10	CorCell <sub>[2]</sub>	2.17 COL	ırtroom [2]	21:10	discussion	OD: [4]   ]	4:9	entities [	II · 21		llowing		:4
	ı i	3:22	27	:1		25:16 3	11:24 34	1:4	especiall		:10 fo	orth [1] 26	(13 [1] 3	:4
	·  c	ord [28] 2:14	6:23 cou	uts (1)	18:21	dismisse	dm 13	3:1	23:1		fo	itunatel	ven j	7:3
		7:5 7:6 10:19 10:24	9:20 cra:	ftily [1]	21:25	dissemin	ated [1]		ESQ [10] 1	:17 1:2	20   <b>fo</b>	rward 171		23
	- 1	12:25 13:14	12:23   crai	fty [1]	24:5	5:6			1:20 2	:2 2:5	1	3:4 18	20 18	3:21
		8:5 18:5	18:5	o-Cell <sub>[2]</sub>	2:17	dissemin: 8:8	ation [1]	ŀ		6 2:9 16	24	4:16 27:	7 30	):19
		8:12 21:21 2:11 23:13	22:2	-		dissolve [	•	:12	essentiall	<b>y</b> [9] 5:1	2 10	und [3] 2:16 32:	5:	15
	2	4:2 24:7		gerous [1]	27:11	distinguis	hahle m	.12	5:18 6:			2:16 32: UF[1] 16:	41 16	1
		7:20 28:1	29:9 date	[1] 35:8		28:25		'	7:4 8: 17:1 17	2 8:2	fra	nk[1] 9:2:	10	I
		9:10 29:13	datii	12 (1)	13:25	distribute	[1] 6:7	1			fra	nkly [2]	9:1	,
•	1.0		11:25   deci.	ded [1]	21.10	distributir	1g.[1] 6:1:	5	et [1]   1:: eventual [1		31	:2		'
	24	1:9 25:15	26:12 defe	ndant [2]	2.10	District [3]	1:1		vidence [		1 44	day [1]	1:1	1
	co	rrects[1]	14.12   5:18		1.	1:2 12:		1	16;21 17:		fro	nt [3] 9:4	20:	
	CO	respondence	[1]   defer	idants [20]	4.0	locuments loesn't [1]			17:14 24:	14	1 40.			ŀ
	1 1/	:22	1 3.47		8:6 11:23 d	one [2], 22:	26:9		xactly[3]	12:2		<b>y</b> [1] 14:1:	9	F .
	100	RROON <sub>[1]</sub> 1	:17   12:13	16:7	16:16 d	ouble-pat	7 30:8	.  a	18:7 18: xception [			] 3:2 le [1] 27:1]		· •
	2:7	insel [12] 1 2:13 2	:22   17:10 :17   19:15	17:15	10.1	19:13	chang [1		78:6 28:6	2] 12:1:	gene	eral [1]		
•	3:9	32:19 3	3:13   28:8		28:6 11:7 d	oubt [1]	22:1:		cuse [1]	17:21	givi	ng [3]	23:1 5:15	
	33:	25 34:12 3:	5:4   32:12		ac	own [1] 8:2		ex	kert [1] 8:5		18:3	33:18	5.15	Į.
			defen	dants' [3] 1	3:22 do	zens [2]	11:14	t ex	istence [2]	20:25	glibl		16:19	)
	1 7:9		16 32:19	33:11 ding [1] 2		1:14 tring [3]	ه ه		7:16		GMS	S [1] 1;8		
	cou	ple [2] 33	:21 defens		1 1	3:22 17:4	9:3	ev	pect [1] pedited [1]	18:16	goal	[1] 28:21		
	34:1	.4	4:4	C [2]	du	ty[1] 19:2:		ex	tant [1]	· - <del>-</del>	30:9	[3] 21:10	30:8	
	conf	4	:20 definit	telym 3	$ E_{1} $	2] 3:2	3:2	ex	tent [1]	26:21	good	ff91	9.0	.
	conf	les [1] 7:7	definit	ion [1] 3]	eff	ect [17]	7:7	F	2) 2:12	30:2	3:8	3:25	3:7 4:7	1
	31:2	se [2] 16:	19 degree	[1] 26	10	:18 13:15	15:12	f/k	Ja[1] 2:14	2:16	4:9	4:13	4:14	.
į	cour		Delawa	ue [8] 1:2	15	:16 15:21 :25 17:6	15;22 26:5	fac	ilitate [1]	10:23	21:1 27:15		25:5	
	1:24	3:7 3:9	1:10 18:20	3:19 9:1	0 26	:17 26:18	28:9	fac	t [8] 17:1	19:11		29:23 Win [3]	2:4	
	3:12 4:13	3:16 4:7	32:7			:11 29:8	31:15	19	:14 20:14	20:18	3:21	4:6	2.4	1
- [	4:13	4:15 4:18 5:1 5:10	deliber	ate [3] 27:	32:	rt [1]	<b>.</b>	20:	18 23:21	28:15	grant	[1] 14:4		1.
-	5:22	5:1 5:10 6:5 8:9	'   27:4	31:4	- CC	orts [2]	5:18 27:7	27:	h[3] 21:1	21:9	grante	d [1]	14:17	1
	8:12	8:18 8:25	delibera	itive [1] 31:	3 27:	10	27:7		10 [12]	5.0	GREC	ORY(1)	1:14	1
- [	9:4 10:9	9:10 10:4 10:15 10:2	derive [1	j 28:.	eith	er [2]	9:12	5:2	3 6:1	5:8 6:19	grindi	ng [1]	26:25	
J.	11:3	10:15 10:2 11:15 11:20			21   35:5	5	-144	8:8	8:15	8:16	group		26:2	
	11:23	12:3 12:10	- Inchoteli	] 34:1	2 Elai	ne [2]	2:6	8:20		24:18	groups		26:19	1
	13:18 14:12	13:24 14:7	D1CK[1]		4:5				iliar [1]	22.11	growth	[2]	12:6	1
	14:24	14:14 14:21 15:4 15:17		11:8	olec:	t [2] 26:14	29:14	fami	ilies [2]	23:11 31:8	13:16	n 1 1 - Č	10.00	1
	15:24	16:17 17:5	Diego [1]	A 1-	1 ^ -	ents [3] 3 24:25	9:23	31:1	6	21:9	guess p 34:18	111:0	17:25	1
	17:10	17:24 18:18	difference	2:12	ende	d 111	0.15	far[1	1 14:5		Gunnin	g m	1:24	1
	18:20 20:6	19:6 19:23	f Aller	©[1] 13:4	enfo	(Ce [1]	8:15	fashi	[1] noi	25:21	halt [1]	26:25		1
	21:5	20:7 20:10 21:13 21:14	35:1	[2] 19:8	Eno1	ander [45]	11:19	fear	21 7:23	23:12	hand (1)	32:12		l
	1:18	21:22 23:7	differentl	<b>y</b> [1] 21:12		4:22	2:5 4:23	feeli	ng (2)	27:6	handed		7:6	[
_	<del></del>			y t-j	4:24	4:25	5:2	31:4			nappeni	1	7:0 6:15	
		•									Lhan	P (1-1 T	U. I.J	

		cv-11673-RW	Z Doc	cument 3	Multi-Pa	iled <sub>M</sub> 11	/22/2004	Pag	ge 14 of 17		
	happy [2] 3:		l <b>g</b> [i] 8:19	James	S [4]				7.12		
Infamm   1   1610   3112   1610   3112   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   1611   320   311   31	•	induceme		2:9	2:16	3:17	letter			11:21	12:1
hearty   15:14   hearty   15:13   hearty   15:14   hear	. 14		4:14 25:5	Jeff [1	1 3:20	· 1	5:8 5:			TO real of	10.4~
	14 4 4	1:12   inducing		JEFF)	REY [1]	2:2		8 6:	12 majore		-
				Jim [2]	3:22	4:5			19 16:15	<b>2</b> ] I	10;3
Solidary	heard missis on	1 10.10	8:5 28:1:	, 130mm f.	3] 2:5	3:21				f21 1	6.18
hearing   11   4-19   held   19   held	30:1		7 (2) 13.11	7.44	-	. [	12:15 15		27:8		0.10
beld   49   35   18.4     18.24   35   12.2     18.24   18.24   25.2     19.2   24.14   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.6     19.2   24.15   25.16     19.2   24.15   25.16     19.2   24.15   25.16     19.2   24.15   24.2     19.2   24.15   2	hearing m 4.1	20:2		Joinea				:15 16:	ı marketi	ing [1] 1:	2:9
18.24   35:12   10:2   26:14   25:5   10:2   26:14   25:5   10:2   26:14   25:5   10:2   26:14   25:5   10:2   26:14   25:5   10:2   26:14   25:5   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:14   10:2   26:14   26:1	held 141 3:5 18	informs [1]	29:18	July [8						lace[1] 2	6:24
highlightied e  5.99   10:2 24:14   25:5   10:0 7:1 3:16   15:23   25:19   15:21   15:23   25:19   15:21   15:23   25:19   15:23   25:19   15:21   15:23   25:19   15:23   15:23   25:19   15:23   15:23   25:19   15:23   1	18:24 35:12	infringe [4]	9:12					,	U ITATASSAC	hussetts (	[1]
1900   1911   1912   1913   1914   1913   1914   1914   1914   1915   1914   1915   1915   1915   1915   1916	highlighted [6] 5:9	10:2 24	:14 25:6	1		1.			2.0		
HITCHENS [0] 2-9   913 923 924 1125 1125   1125		infringem	ent [23]	6:19	7:1 8				maries [		
Indication   13   15   16   17   17   17   17   17   17   18   17   18   17   18   18							everage [1]	8:5			
	HIT CHENS [1] 2:9	12:7 12:				3:23 [];	ability [7]		1 10.0		
3:11   3:15   4:9   22:20   22:23   23:5   3   11:16   17:18   17:19   11:16   17:18   17:19   11:16   17:18   17:19   11:16   17:18   17:19   11:16   17:18   17:19   11:16   17:18   17:19   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:18   11:15   11:15   11:18   11:15	1**	18:25 19:	20 19:21			3:13	15:17 15:	19 18:9	McGarr		
4:14   4:22   5:2   2:41   2:424   2:51			14 22:19						4:5		,
5:17   6:6   6:9   7:10   82.   8:11   9:2   10:11   10:11	4:14 4:22 5:2			12:16		7.10			mean [6]	11:14 14:	:12
Page   10-8   10-12   13-13   14-44   14-17   13-13   13-14   14-17   13-13   13-14   14-17   13-13   13-14   14-17   13-14	5:17 6:6 6:9	25:3 25::	5			1	8:24 21:2	0 22:1	23:17		
13:19   14:4   14:17   15:6   15:21   16:6   16:25   20:22   21:2   12:24   22:24   22:24   22:24   22:24   22:24   22:24   22:24   23:15   16:18   10:23   13:13   3:13   23:22   23:22   23:24   22:24   23:15   16:18   1		infringing	(i) 19:22		-		2:19 23:1	2	1 21,2		
15:66   15:21   16:66   15:21   16:65   15:21   16:65   20:22   12:22   12:22   12:22   12:22   12:23   12:2		initiated [3]				lie			I	e [1] 17:	16
	15:6 15:21 16:6	9:18 20:1	14	Keep [2]	29:22 29	· I ^				a <b>nn</b> (t)	
22:24   22:24   22:24   23:25   23:2			[2] 14:17	Kind [2]	8:8 31	.24				1.21	1
33:15   27:21   29:24   31:18   31:23   32:18   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   31:5   33:10   35:14   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31   35:16   35:31	7-1-4		10.00	3.0 VII K [8]		2	3:22 23:2	3 24:2	mentione	d (2) 14-3	
31:14   31:23   32:18   33:24   33:16   33:24   33:16   33:24   33:16   33:24   33:16   33:1	23:15 27:21 29:24	4 lincoferm				,   "	-,		7   19:3		,
35:3   35:10   35:14   instead [t]   34:21   instead [t]   34:21   instead [t]   35:16   Si.16   Si.	31:14 31:23 32:18	31.5	10:18	knowing	g [1] 27	no Inc			merely [2]	10:2	25
Solidation   Sol		inotond	34:21	known	10:	, 2.		33:9			
Honor's [1]	35:16	instructions	rn 21:11	Kobialk	a [2] 1:2			12:11	message [		
HONORABLE [1]	Honor's [1] 24:17	intellectual				16	:13 28:5		ատասանը <u>լ</u> յ	•	3
	HONORABLE[1]		29:6						18:15 23		
idea [i]   18:15   intended [i]   6:20   intent [i]   7:22   intent [i]   7:22   intent [i]   7:23   intended [i]   6:19   27:15   intent [i]   13:3   interfere [i]   27:15   interfere [i]   27:13   interfere [i]   27:18		111.10 10-	9:16	21.5	[7] 7:1 11:20 12:0		:11 :11	. 13:1	34:10		'
ideas [1] 30.5   ident [a]   7:22   large [a] 26:19   27:25   28:2   light [a] 7:24   list [a] 17:24   list [a] 17:25   lis	idea (1) 19.15		6.20					10.22	mislead [1]	26:10	) [
identical processed residence processed resi	ideas m 30.5	intent (3)			6:19 27:2	25   28:	2	-0.22	misleadin	g [17] 6:1	- 1
13:3   immediate [3]   5:12   interested [2]   13:24   27:13   late [2]   9:5   9:7   law [1]   20:25   law [1]   20:2	12.1	16:19 27:16	1.22					10:5			
interfere [2]   13:24   1ate [2]   9:5   9:7   1aw [1]   20:25   1aw [1]   9:16   1imerdately [1]   16:3   interfere [2]   27:18   interfere [2]   27:18   interfere [2]   27:18   interfere [2]   31:3   interfere [2]   27:18   interfuptod [1]   11:4   introductions [2]   interded [1]   11:4   introductions [2]   31:3   31:5   interfuptod [1]   11:4   involved [2]   i	13:3		27:25						8:22 9:1	7 15:9	- 1
15:23   16:9     12:11   15:13   16:14   17   17   17   17   17   17   17	immediate [3] 5:12	interested [2]	13:24			lim	110000[1]			9 19:17	
laws [1]   5:13   interfering [2]   27:18   laws [1]   9:1   laws [1]   9:1   limited [1]   32:6   line [5]   3:19   3:21   limited [1]   3:6   line [5]   3:19   3:21   line [5]   3:19   3:21   line [5]   3:19   3:22   line [5]   3:19   3:22   line [5]   3:19   3:22   line [5]   3:19   3:21   line [5]   3:19   3:22   line [5]   3:22   line [5]   3:22   line [5]   3:2	15:23 16:9					7:2	1 15·18			2 24:18	- 1
important [1]   11:6   imprimatur [1]   27:10   improper [1]   8:5   improper [1]   8:5   improper [1]   31:9   3:25   4:11   27:2   lawsuits [10]   9:8   21:24   20:3   20:13   20:14   listen [1]   12:17   listen [1]   12:10   listen [1]   12:17   listen [1]   12:10   listen [1]		111terrere [2]				22:	11	22.3		. 4.1	- 1
11:6   imprimatur	impact[i] 5:13		ŀ			, limi	ted [1]	32:6	24:23		- 1
Improper	important [1] 11:6	27:18	27.10	19:14 20	21:4	line			misspoke [1	] 8:18	
Interrupted [i]   11:4   introductions [2]   3:13   3:15   interrupted [i]   11:4   involved [2]   10:13   lawyer [i]   11:11   lawyers [i]   26:19   27:1   30:22   17:4   23:11   3:8   4:1   4:7   4:9   4:13   4:14   4:9   4:13		interrupt [1]	25:7						misunderst	anding [1]	
inaccurate [2] 21:21	improper[1] 8:5	interrupted [1]	11:4			Lisa	[2] 1:20	4:11	12:17		- [
24:2		introductions	[2]				1] 24:24				
inappropriate [1]   26:7   26:7   27:4   23:11   26:19   27:8   27:1   26:19   27:8   27:1	24:2	3:13 3:15		20:19 20		.   11000	u[1]		moment [1]		-
Involves [1]   10:19	•	involved [2]		lawyer[1]	11:11	[JIIIIga	atiON [6] 17·4				-
Inaudible[1]	26:7		10:10	awyers [1]	26:19	27:1	30:22	23.11	4:9 4:13		1
Inc [6]	inaudible[1] 11:14	involvinom	*	ayperson	[1] 11:11	litiga	ations [1]	9:16	Morris [2]		1
2:17 inclined [2]		irrelevant		ayperson'		LLP	[5] 1:19		3:17		1
inclined [2] 34:25 35:1   issue [7] 13:22 16:11   learned [1] 16:8   least [11] 7:16 7:17   lincluding [1] 16:3 incorrect [1] 19:17 increase [1] 12:3   9:5 9:7   leave [3] 22:25 23:10   leave [3] 22:25   leave		irreparable 121	I		2:2						
35:1	12	31:11	1 '		17:0	33.10	[3] 12:3	13:16			1
including [1] 16:3	35:1	issue [7] 13:22	16:11 16	285† 1112 7-14	10:8			25.0			
increase [1] 19:17 issued [3] 9:3 9:5 9:7 increased [1] 12:5 issued [5] 10:2 issued [5] 7:13 7:21 8:5 17:9 22:25   17:9   12:0 1:24   12:14   12:15   12:14   12:15   12:14   12:15   12:14   12:15   12:14   12:15	including [1] 16:3		23:17			losen	#6 [1] 11 - \$1.1∩	35:8			1
increase [1] 12:3   9:5 9:7   32:6 32:7 32:9   M [1] 1:14   mail [1] 26:4   mailed [1] 26:3   32:20   led [1] 19:12   legal [4] 9:15 10:1   10:6 10:7 10:9   moved [3] 4:18   14:4 14:16   Mover [2] 2:2   3:20   mailing [11] 6:14   Ms [1] 35:6   must m 24:24   mu	incorrect[1] 19:17		. 2	24:13 25:2	21 31:4	1088	1 27.10				
indicated [5] 7:13 7:21 8:5 17:9 22:25    issues [5]   10:2   13:21   14:1   19:13   19:12   13:27   13:27   13:21   1:20   1:24   1:24   1:24   1:24   1:26   1:24   1:26   1:26   1:26   1:27   1:20   1:24   1:26   1:27   1:20   1:24   1:26   1:27   1:27   1:28	increase [1] 12:3		1 -		32:9				moved [3]	4:18	
indicated [5] 7:13 7:21 8:5 17:9 22:25   13:21 14:1 19:13   10.2	increased[1] 12:5	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	10.2	ave [3] 22:2	23:10		1.17 11 26.4	1.			1
7:21 8:5 17:9 32:7   Gd [1] 19:12   mailing [11] 6:14   Ms [1] 35:6   10:6 10:7 10:9   must m 24:24	indicated [5] 7:13	13:21 14:1			•	maile	•	26.2	Moyer <sub>[2]</sub>	2:2	1
1:20 1:24 24:16 29:1 10:6 10:7 10:9 must m 24:24	7:21 8:5 17:9	32:7	120			mailir	orisi Marij				1
1 4 1.4 27.1 ( 4	44:25	J <sub>[2]</sub> 1:20	1:24			10:6					1
						10:10			must[1] 24:24		l

			-cv-116		Docur	ment 31	//dlti-p	iled.	11/22/200	04 P	age 1	5 of 17		
• •	14 [1]	3:2		0:2 /20:20	21:20	Park [1]	1:21	- <u>6</u> -v				<del></del>	ท -	reason
•	named [1 nation [1]			2:10 22:13 3:11 23:23		part [2]	16:7	16:15	Philade PHILIP	rbura [1]		problem	aticni	13:6
	nature [2]		10.23	4:19 25:4	24:8 25:19	particu	-	13:4	phone (5		1:17	procedu	ral <sub>[2]</sub>	13:21
	17:22	. 9	/:7 2	7:19 28:10	29:4	25:13	32:14			· .	3:24 34:10	15:3		ĺ
	near[1]	35-9		29:19		particu	larly [2]	5:23	35:7		24:10	ргоседи	- •	13:25
	necessar	ilv rat 2		):11 31:8 :8	31:16	20:18			phones [	1] ;	30:14	process process process		5:21
	26:25 2			tain [1]	4.10	parties   27:6		27:2	phrase [1	1 2	23:21		11:5	28:22
	necessary	y [1] Y	4:25 ob	tained [1]	4:19 11:12	parts [1]		30:21	physicia	ns [4]		processe		1:4
	need [11] 7		16 ob	viously [4]		pass[1]			10:11	10:20 2	6:2	Procter [3		:4
			):17   11	27:25		past[1]			Pillsbury	[2] 2	:11	3:21 4	:6	`
			$^{0:19}$ loca	urred [1]	ı	past(1) patent (1:		C 22	plaintiff			products	[1] 2	7:8
	needs [3]		0cc	urs [1]	12:17			6:23 8:24				profits [1]		1:7
	30:21 31	1:20	UCT	ober[1]	12:22	18:25	19:2 1	9:5	17:22	4		prompted	[1] 1]	1:7
	neutral [2]	30:	:16 offe	end [1]	26:10			9:21	play [2] 2	7:11 27		proper	18	3:15
- 1	30:21		offe	nsive [1]		patentee		8:17	point [8] 6:	:11 8:	, II	roperty [-		:10
	never[1]9:		offe	T[1] 7:16	]*	20:1	[2] 18	3:17		0:11 20	:14	27:17 29		2:7
- 1	new[11] 9:1 12:13 12:		offe	red [1]	. 17:21	oatents (i	2] 8:	3	pointing [			rotect [5] 27:16 29	13 :2 29	
1	12:13 12: 19:14 19:			ce [1]	33:20	9:3	:9 9 <u>:</u>	13 -	points [1]		:10	29:6		
- 1	20:2 24:		,   🗸	cial [1]	1.24			:14	possibilit	20,	!!	rotected [	1] 28:	:14
1	next[3] 30:	14 33:2	, jomu	ted [1]	3:25		4:9 24 8:24	·-•	18:22 33	:4	10 p	rovide [3]	9:1	
	34:14		27:2	[3] 7:23	23:15 p	atience [		23	possible [3	<b>]</b> 10:		23:23 32:		- 1
1,	Vone [1] 7:20	0	- 1	in-a-lifeti	ma co	atients (2	27:	20	28:7 31:		2	rovided (2 23:24	21:	1
l k	onetheless Vorthern [1]		1 31:10	32:3	. , ,	29:13		- 11	post [1] 32:	•	pı	roviders [	23:2	22
ln.	ose [1] 21:1	12:2	louc fr	5] 5:9	9:13	aul <sub>[5]</sub> 1::		- 1	oost-trial [: 6:9	2] 5:2	pr	udent[1]	25:2	
. N	IOTE <sub>[1]</sub>	3:4	10:17 19:4	13:21	18:24	1.11 2/ 1.XSOn [2]	:21 33:	D  _	osted [1]	6,15	lnn	ıblic[i]	20:2	
n	othing [3]	9:16	25:19		21:22   F3 32:10   3	:22	2:1:		osting [2]	6:13 10:6	. լթս	urpose [2]	7:23	
1	12:20 20:4	5.10	32:11		3:9 pa	ying [2]	28:1	6	10:7		29	9:17	,	1
no	otice [5]	4:16	33:16		2	8:18		P	otential [4]		1 3/	rposes [2] 4:3	32:5	- 1
	1:17 12:2 8:15	18:14		1] 31:23	pe	ndency	-	l D	18:8 18:i		9	rsuant [1]	10.0	.
	tification	**: Fix 10.5	29:17	tunities [1]	pe 14	nding [2]	14:6		otter [2] 4:10	1:17	DU	rsuing [3]	19:2: 9:16	<b>'</b> [
по	tify[1]	19:24	oppor	unity [6] 1		nnsylvar	าร์สเก		ractice [2]	10:18	1 10	:7 19:15		- 1 -
. No	ovember (2)	12:21	31:11	32:3 3	3:13 2:.	16	110 [1]	1	3:22	10.10	pui			- 1
12	2:22	1	33:19 <b>opposi</b>	34:13	peo	ple [14]	5:14	PI	actices [1]	16:3	18:	:17 12:21 :13 24:16		.
no	W [11] 7:13 l:2 14:19	12:12	opposi	te [1]   ]   ]		:17 15:1 :25 16:1		pi	actitioner: 6:3	S [1]	32:		20:13	
	1:2 14:19 5:20 16:8	15:14 18:18	order		16:	20 17:1	0 16:13 0 18:14		eempt[1]		que	<b>Ty</b> [1]	14:10	
22	:20 24:15	25:14	4:20	3] 4: 5:3 5::	- 20.	16 32:2		, .	efer <sub>[6]</sub>	5:21	qui	ckly [1]	33:17	
nuı	mber[1]	25:19	5:22	5:23 6:	32.			13	3:8 13:9	13:7 21:6	quit	te [4] 9:17	9:25	1
nur	merous [4]	9:14	6:3 7:12	6:4 6:5 7:19 7:2	per	ceive [1] cent [2]	21:17	23	3:21 32:20		11::			
0.	:14 19:5	29:17	8:1	7:19 7:2 8:5 8:7		ծու [2] 17	12:6	pro	liminary	2] 14:17		[1] 6:9		***
O'C	] 3:2 lock[i]		14:4	15:24 21:	18 perf	orm[1]	22:15	14	:18 esent <sub>[1]</sub>		quo	te [2] 7:5 tes [1]	13:7	
obli	igation [2]	1:11	21:23 24:17	22:4 23: 24:17 24:	nort	aps [9]	8:18		sently [1]	35:12	R[1]	3:2	21:6	
18:3	17 .	18:13	24:25	25:17 25:	11:9	25:21	26:15		serve[1]	26:23 6:8		[1] 12:6		
obli	gations [1]	28:15		25:24 26:			30:6		SS [14]	12:19	rates	[1] 13:16		
JOOST	tetrician [9]	5:10	34:21 orders [1	35:2		[1] 27:12		12:	20 12:24	18:2	rathe	T [2]	25:23	1
7:5 15:1	13:14	15:17	Otherwi	8:4	neric		32:6	18: 23:		20:2	29:5		_,,_,	1
23:4		21:9	overturn	•	Perk	ins [2]	1:19	28:		25:20 31:25	reach	1[1] 35:5		į.
	etricians [5	551	over [1]	ed[1] []:]  5:0	4:12			32:		31,23	react	ion [1]	11:21	1
1 3:7	5:14	5:19		): <b>2</b>	perm	anent [1]	32:10	pres	sure [1]	5:18	read [	3] 20:5	26:1	
5:19 6:16		6:8	p.m(1) 3		Phari	naStem		pres	suring [1]	12:10	26:4 readin	no re-	00.15	1
7:18			Page [1] 2		1:4 6:3	4:10 6:7	5:6	pret	ty [2]	12:4	reade	ոց [լ] [1] 31:16	29:15	1
9:12			paragrap		8:10	25:16	8:3 25:18	17:1			real m		10.22	j
9:20	9:25	10:11	6:24 7	3 20:5	25:24	27:25	31:19	hiea	enting [1]	8:7	18:23	1 12:11	18:22	l
11:18 13:8		13:5	21:3 2. 24:5	1:25 23:20	32:12		33:22	21:1	iously [2]	13:4.	really	[3]	6:6	l
16:24	4	16:2 18:3	24:5 Paragraph	15 m	Pharn 5:18	aStem's			.i1		11:7	21:17		
18:8	18:11	I.E	25:14	18 [2] 21:3	27:15	6:13	23:22	proh	ability [1]		realm		12:14	
19:19			Pardon [1]	33:1	Phil (2	4:10	13:19	prop		32:23	reason		4:24	
	<u></u>		(-)	JJ.1				33:16	) (*)	JE.E3	20:23 33:16	25:21 2	8:22	
-										!.			- 1	

•			<u>cv-11673</u> -F		ocun	nent 3 <b>1/1</b> 4	ti-Pag	ed	11/22/2004	l Pa	ige 16 of <u>1</u>	7	4
	reasons (3		1:22 RIC	$D_{11}$ 2	:9	shield[1]		7:10				casons	
•		3:17	Richa	rds [2] 2	:2	short[1] 4:			such [3] 4:1		124-	10F[4]	4:16
	received	-	0:10 3:20			side [3] 3:	15 4:	4	28:18	7,		24:5	30:3
	recent [1]		):13   right [1		:15	30:7		•	sue [s] 13	7 19	too [1] totali:		
	receptivit	•	):7   11:5		4:8	sides [1] 27	1:6		21:6 23:			ıy (ı)	25:1
	recognize	[2] 3:	10   14:12 15:12			sign [1] 21			sued[9] 7:8		JUULLI	[1]35:6	
	30:21		21.16			significan		-23	9:14 12:	13 16	. Tack	1] 16:8	
	record [4]		:2 27.15		5:15	16:7 16			19:19 19:	21 24:	.7   Tansc	ript (1)	17:7
	15:22 16		rights [		:17	similar (2)	7:1		29:20		trial [4		8:4
	reference (	[3] 15: :20	ringing		:14	19:11			sufficient [		4   12:21	17:3	
	reflect [1]	•	wig Isa su		11	imilarly [	1] 26:	5	suggested [		tried [1	] 19:9	
	reflected [1	15:	" In a	'S [3] 2::	16	imply [7]	6:2	2	suggesting		16   1 RO [2	14:16	14:17
	reflecting	7:2	13.22	33:25	- 1	7:15 7:2			22:20 30:2		trouble		25:10
	refuse [1]		Iranionia		.17 1	21:20 22:			suggestion	-	1 0000		18:7
:	refusing [3]	5:20	rounda		, IS	ingle [3]	113	9	suggests [2]	16:1	23:25	24:20	
	16:4 29:		4 Rovner			19:4 19:					truth [3]	18:10	19:18
	regarding [		4:9	4:10 13:	10	LEET [1]	1:14		suing [7] 9:9 18:7 24:8	13:5 28:9	' 1.	26:19	20.0
•	regardless		1, 10,10	13:25 14:	J	mart [1]	32:8		28:9 29:4		34:9	34:15	30:6
	Registry [1]			14:11 14: 14:23 15:		olution [1]	32:1		suits [1] 20:20		trying		21:2
	regretfully		25.11	14:23 15: 35:14		omewhere		ŀ	suspicion [1]		8 29:21	•	41,4
	relating [1]		royalty			OTY[1] 11:3		i	sustain [3]	11:1		[1]	5:13
	release [21]	9:1	28:18	*	191	ought [1]	6:3		11:23 17:10	) **.1.	turn [1]		
j	12:20 12:2	12:1 4 18:2	Trane [1]			eaks [1]	13:2		sword [1]	27:10	I .	9:9	10:17
į	18:2 19:1	6 20:2	ruled [4]	5:10 12:1	6 si	ecifically			system [1]	31:1	11:9	21:3	22:18
	23:17 24:1	5 25:1:	3   15:17	18:18	sp	elled [1]	13:1:	,	Systems [1]	2:13	24:9	24:10	;
1	25:20 26:4 27:14 28:5		1	1] 21:1		age [1] 25:1		- 1	table [i] 31:21		type [3]	10:14	19:13
	29:15 29:1		Truming			anding [2] 4:4	10:17	7	takes [1] 27:5		Tyre-Da	lovein	25.0
- 1	31:25 32:2			3:2	1	art [6] 3:12	3:14		technology [1	j 28:17	U.S.D.C		
- 1	released [1]	12:19		7:16 17:1	/   5		8:19	ŀ	teed[1] 21:15		umbilic:		1:14 6:23
j.	releasing [1]	12:24	safely[1]			):14		- [:	telephone [3]	1:12			0:23 <b>22:</b> 10
1	relevance [1]	. 14:1	San [1] 2			irted [ij 🕠	16:4	-1.	3:4 35:17	• •	23:24		24:6
1	elevant[1]	28:12	satisfy [1]		sta	tement [14		1	telling [5]	11:13		7	7:14
1	emain [1]	14:7	says [8] 7   7:19 9		7:		8:15		12:9 17:10 22:7	19:18	22:14 34:25	26:6	33:16
I	emains [1]	26:21		:17 15:20 2:6 24:18	' I		15:7 23:25	lt	temporary [1]	32:10	underlie		
r	emarks [1]	20:13	schedule		25	:13 26:9	26:11	lt	tend [1] 31:3	32.10	understa	[1] 3	32:14
	emind[1]	34:24	schedules	[1] 34:11		:16			term [1] 35:9		21:5 2		4:5 6:24
n	eplete [1]	15:22	second[1]		Sta	tements [9]	5:8		erminal [1]	19:12		0:24	0.27
u	<b>eply</b> (1) 15:4		see [3] 12		5:2 8:2		7:10	1	Thank [3]	35:10	Understo		5:3
R	eporter[1]	1:24	28:4	23,10	24		14:13	- 13	35:14 35:16	22.10	unfortun	ate m 2	9:9
R	EPORTER	'S [1]	seek [1] 4:	19		es (2)	1:1	tl	hanks [1]	4:15	unfortun	atelym	
	3:4	•	seeking [2]	<b>6</b> :6	24:		1.1	ti	heories [5]	18:25	27:2	•	i
	ports [1]	11:15	8:7			us [2]	6:9		22:18 24:10	24:16	UNITED	[1] 1:	
	present [1]	16:17	seem [1] 31		35:				29:1		unlicense		
	presented [1		sell [2] 7:1	6 7:16	-	red [1]	34:5		heory [ז] 10:1 20:15	9:15	18:5 18 29:10	3:12 <b>2</b> 9	9:8
	quest [1]	35:2	selling [1]	7:20		[1] 11:7			24:9 26:14	20:16 32:13	unsimilar		
	quired[1]	24:25	send [2] 32:			S [1] 22:15			HERAPEUT	ICS m		[1] 12 ):1 17	:20
I.E	solves[1]	32:6	sense [3] 7:1	3 21:18		[4] 14:5	14:14	1	l:4				:0
I Te	spect [ត្រ 5:17 15:25	5:10	30:6		16:1		•	th	ereabouts [1]	5:6	uses [1] 13		
	9:2 21:11	17:18	sent [5] 5:5			[1] 18:16		th	iey've [2]	15:16	using [2] 11		:10
	spond [4]	8:9	12:2 16:5 sentence [1]			រខ្ពុ [រ]	24:14		7:22		utilize [1]	.22 33: 27:	
	13 14:19	35:16	seriously [1			ed (1)	26:1	th	ird [1] 23:20		V[1] 1:6		<b>"</b>
res	sponded [1]	16:3	service [2]			ect [2]	6:12	the	ousands [1]	16:1	vacate[3]	, 6:3	
Tes	sponse[3]	17:9	10:14	7:20	7:9			th	reatened [1]	31:8	6:5 14:		- 1
17	1:13 33:19	- 1 42	serviced [1]	20.10		nit [1]	7:10	th	reats [1]	8:4	Valerie [1]	1:24	4
	ult [2]	29:14	services [1]	28:13	Subs 14:9	tance [2]	14:1	thu	ree [1] 24:24		various [1]	25:4	
	:14			27:8		antial	6.10	thr	rough [3]	5:19	verdict [6]	25 11:1	
res	ulted [1]	12:4			outs	antial [1]	5:12	13	3:1 13:13	.	11:16 11:	24 17:1	
rev	ealing[1]	26:13	setting [1]	26:13	19:8	antially (1	J	thr	roughout [1]	10:23	17:18 17:	19	·
Tev	enues [2]	12:4	several [2] 9:8	9:3		antive [2]	14.1	thu	ımbing [1]	21:17	viable [2]	9:15	;
28:	:2	1		•	15:5	ашиve [2]	14:1	tod	iay [4]	22:21	31:17		1
			shall[1] 24:18	5	L			33:		5:7	ViaCell <sub>[8]</sub>	1:7	-

Case 1:04-cv-1	<u>1673</u> -RW <u>Z</u>	Document	3Mdlti-Pa	iled 11/22/2004	Page 17 of 17	
2:7 3:20 3:22 9:6 17:16 17:16	,					view -
33:22 view [4] 5:17 18:23 24:5 25:15						
views [2] 22.25				·		
32:4 violated [1] 5:4						
violation [1] 8:1						
virtually [1] 6:15 visit [1] 26:4						
voice [1] 3:10	•					
walk [1] 27:1 wants [1] 21:13						
ways [2] 6:25 7:11					·	
weak [1] 23:5 website [4] 6:13	-					
10:7 26:5 32:22						
34:14						
whatsoever[1] 13:16 whereas [2] 28:17					1	
28:21	-					i
willful <sub>[1]</sub> 12:7						
WILLIAM [1] 2:12 WILLIAMS [1] 2:9					·	I
Willing [2] 32-17						·
32:18 Wilmington [1] 1:10						- 1
win [1] 27:9 wind [1] 34:20						
WINTHRIP (1) 2:11						- 1
Winthrop [1] 4:3 wish [1] 34:24						1
without [5] 15:18						1.
22:3 26:13 27:8 33:18						
word [2] 11:9 11:22 works [1] 31:1						
world [1] 22:9						
worried[1] 16:2 worry [2] 11:16	-			:	7-	
29:19						
written [1] 33·10				1		
yesterday [1] 12:3 yet [3] 3:24 6:7						
31:10						
						l
						1
						- 1
		1				